

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
EUREKA DIVISION**

DANIEL CANADAY, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

COMCAST CORPORATION, et al

Defendants.

**Case No.: 4:15-cv-04648-JSW**

JASON WILLIAMS, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

COMCAST CORPORATION, et al

Defendants.

**Case No.: 4:15-cv-04732-JSW**

LAMBERTO VALENCIA, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

COMCAST CORPORATION, et al

Defendants.

**Case No.: 4:15-cv-04771-JSW**

JEFFREY COLEMAN, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

COMCAST CORPORATION, et al

Defendants.

**Case No.: 4:15-cv-04782-JSW**

RICHARD NELSON, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

COMCAST CORPORATION, et al

Defendants.

**Case No.: 4:15-cv-04793-JSW**

CALEB DUBOIS, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

COMCAST CORPORATION, et al

Defendants.

**Case No.: 4:15-cv-04809-JSW**

GREGORY PETERS, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

COMCAST CORPORATION, et al

Defendants.

**Case No.: 4:15-cv-04869-JSW**

1 LUPE LANDIN, JR. and EDUARDO  
2 MURILLO,

3 Plaintiffs,

4 v.

5 COMCAST CORPORATION, and  
6 COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,  
7 INC.,

8 Defendants.

**Case No. 4:16-cv-04174-JSW**

9 CORY BARRETT HALL,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 COMCAST CORPORATION, and  
13 COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,  
14 INC.,

15 Defendants.

**Case No. 4:16-cv-004175-JSW**

16 FRANCISCO FLORES and ANTHONY  
17 BUSTOS-CABRERA,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 v.

20 COMCAST CORPORATION, and  
21 COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,  
22 INC.,

23 Defendants.

**Case No. 4:16-cv-04176-JSW**

24 JOSEPH JOSHUA DAVIS, et al.

25 Plaintiffs,

26 v.

27 COMCAST CORPORATION, and  
28 COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,  
INC.,

Defendants.

**Case No. 4:16-cv-04177-JSW**

JAMES K. GRIMES and CARLOS  
RAMOS,

Plaintiffs,

**Case No. 4:16-cv-04178-JSW**

v.  
COMCAST CORPORATION, and  
COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,  
INC.,  
Defendants.

STEPHEN MCBRIDE, et al.  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
COMCAST CORPORATION, and  
COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,  
INC.,  
Defendants.

**Case No. 4:16-cv-04179-JSW**

LAWRENCE ELKINS, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
COMCAST CORPORATION, and  
COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,  
INC.,  
Defendants.

**Case No. 4:16-CV-04180-JSW**

HERNAN PAEZ, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
COMCAST CORPORATION, and  
COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,  
INC.,  
Defendants.

**Case No. 4:16-cv-04181-JSW**

KRIS COOK, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
COMCAST CORPORATION, and  
COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,  
INC.,

**Case No. 4:16-cv-04182-JSW**

Defendants.

KEVIN HUFFMAN, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

COMCAST CORPORATION, and  
COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,  
INC.,

Defendants.

**Case No. 4:16-cv-04183-JSW**

**[PROPOSED] ORDER re PRODUCTION  
OF PRIVILEGE LOG AND  
DISCOVERY DISPUTES**

Two motions filed by Defendant Comcast Cable Communication Management, LLC (“Comcast”) (erroneously sued as Comcast Corporation and Comcast of Contra Costa, Inc.) to compel discovery were heard on October 4, 2016, before the Honorable Nandor J. Vadas. The first motion pertained to section III of Defendant’s discovery brief of July 25, 2016, seeking production of a privilege log, with regard to which this Order shall apply to all the Canaday related cases. The second motion concerned Defendant’s discovery letter brief of September 16, 2016, which is decided by this Order in its entirety and applies to the following actions: *Davis v. Comcast Corporation*, Case No. 4:16-cv-04177-JSW, *Paez v. Comcast Corporation*, Case No. 4:16-cv-0-4181-JSW, *Cook v. Comcast Corporation*, Case No. 4:16-cv-04182-JSW, and *Huffman v. Comcast Corporation*, Case No. 4:16-cv-04183-JSW.

Patrick Terry, Esq., and Arlo Uriarte, Esq., appeared on behalf of all Plaintiffs. Stephen Tausch, Esq. and Fred Alvarez, Esq., appeared on behalf of Defendant Comcast. After considering the parties’ positions, and counsel’s arguments, the Court hereby Orders as follows:


With respect to Roman Numeral III, of the Defendant’s motion filed July 25, 2016, 2016, seeking to compel a privilege log, the Court Orders that, with respect to all the *Canaday* related cases now pending in the Northern District of California, Defendant’s motion to compel a privilege log is denied. The Court denies Defendant’s motion without prejudice to Defendant’s renewing the motion in the event that Plaintiffs assert the relevance of notice of

1 decertification in subsequent motions or Judge White, in subsequent rulings, concludes that  
2 notice of decertification is relevant to determining the tolling period.

3 With respect to Defendant's motion filed on September 16, 2016, the court orders that  
4 with respect to issue 1, Plaintiffs Cayenne, Souza and Agundez shall respond, which may  
5 include any objections, to outstanding discovery, or determine whether to seek dismissal of  
6 their actions, by October 14, 2016. The Court further orders that, with respect to issue 2  
7 regarding RFP No. 27, Plaintiffs in *Huffman, Cook, Paez* and *Davis* are to provide responses,  
8 which may include objections, by October 14th. The court further orders that, with respect to  
9 issue 3, Defendant's request for amended responses is denied.  
10

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**  
12

13  
14 DATED: October 18, 2016

  
15 Honorable Nandor J. Vadas  
16 United States Magistrate Judge  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28